arXiv:1609.03846v2 [math.AP] 1 Feb 2017

# Cyclic asymptotic behaviour of a population reproducing by fission into two equal parts

Étienne Bernard * Marie Doumic †‡ Pierre Gabriel §

February 2, 2017

**Abstract**

We study the asymptotic behaviour of the following linear growth-fragmentation equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u(t,x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\big(xu(t,x)\big) + B(x)u(t,x) = 4B(2x)u(t,2x),$$

and prove that under fairly general assumptions on the division rate $B(x)$, its solution converges towards an oscillatory function, explicitely given by the projection of the initial state on the space generated by the countable set of the dominant eigenvectors of the operator. Despite the lack of hypo-coercivity of the operator, the proof relies on a general relative entropy argument in a convenient weighted $L^2$ space, where well-posedness is obtained via semigroup analysis. We also propose a non-dissipative numerical scheme, able to capture the oscillations.

**Keywords:** growth-fragmentation equation, self-similar fragmentation, long-time behaviour, general relative entropy, periodic semigroups, non-hypocoercivity

## Introduction

Over the last decades, the mathematical study of the growth-fragmentation equation and its linear or nonlinear variants has led to a wide literature.

Several facts explain this lasting interest. First, variants of this equation are used to model a wide range of applications, from the internet protocol suite to cell division or polymer growth; it is also obtained as a useful rescaling for the pure fragmentation equation (then the growth rate is linear). Second,

*Laboratoire de Géodésie, IGN-LAREG, Bâtiment Lamarck A et B, 35 rue Hélène Brion, 75013 Paris. Email: etienne.bernard@ign.fr

†Sorbonne Universités, Inria, UPMC Univ Paris 06, Mamba project-team, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions. Email adress: marie.doumic@inria.fr

‡Wolfgang Pauli Institute, c/o Faculty of Mathematics of the University of Vienna

§Laboratoire de Mathématiques de Versailles, UVSQ, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, 45 Avenue des États-Unis, 78035 Versailles cedex, France. Email: pierre.gabriel@uvsq.fr

despite the relative simplicity of such a one-dimensional equation, the study of its behaviour reveals complex and interesting interplays between growth and division, and a kind of dissipation even in the absence of diffusion. Finally, the underlying stochastic process has also - and for the same reasons - raised much interest, and only recently links between the probabilistic approach and the deterministic one begin to be investigated.

In its general linear form, the equation may be written as follows

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u(t,x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\big(g(x)u\big) + B(x)u(t,x) = \int_x^\infty k(y,x)B(y)u(t,y)dy,$$

where $u(t,x)$ represents the concentration of individuals of size $x \geqslant 0$ at time $t$, $g(x) \geqslant 0$ their growth rate, $B(x) \geqslant 0$ their division rate, and $k(y,x) \geqslant 0$ the quantity of individuals of size $x$ created out of the division of individuals of size $y$.

The long-time asymptotics of this equation has been studied and improved in many successive papers. Up to our knowledge, following the biophysical pioneering papers [7, 6, 32], the first mathematical study was carried out in [12], where the equation was considered for the mitosis kernel / binary fission ($k(y,x) = 2\delta_{x=\frac{y}{2}}$) in a compact set $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$. The authors proved the central behaviour of the equation, already conjectured in [7]: under balance and regularity assumptions on the coefficients, there exists a unique dominant eigenpair ($\mathcal{U}(x) \geqslant 0, \lambda > 0$) such that $u(t,x)e^{-\lambda t} \to \mathcal{U}(x)$ in a certain sense, with an exponential speed of convergence. In [12], the proofs were based on semigroups methods and stated for the space of continuous functions provided with the supremum norm. Many studies followed: some of them, most notably and recently [27], relaxing the previous assumptions in the context of semigroup theory [1, 4, 5, 16, 18]; others deriving explicit solutions [21, 33, 34] or introducing new methods - one of the most elegant and powerful being the *General Relative Entropy* [26], leading to convergence results in norms weigthed by the adjoint eigenproblem. However, though in some cases the entropy method may lead to an explicit spectral gap in some integral norm [31, 24, 29], or when the coefficients are such that an entropy-entropy dissipation inequality exists [10, 2], in general it fails to provide a rate of convergence.

In the margins of this central behaviour, some papers investigated non-uniqueness [3] or other kinds of asymptotics, happening for instance when the balance or mixing assumptions between growth and division fail to be satisfied: e.g. when the fragmentation dominates the growth [4, 9, 20, 13]. A stronger "memory" of the initial behaviour may then be observed, contrarily to the main case, where the only memory of the initial state which remains asymptotically is a weighted average.

Among these results, the case when the growth rate is linear, *i.e.* $g(x) = x$, and the mother cell divides into two equal offspring, *i.e.* $k(y,x) = 2\delta_{x=\frac{x}{2}}$, holds a special place, both for modelling reasons - it is the emblematic case of idealised bacterial division cycle, and also the rescaling adapted to the pure fragmentation

equation - and as a limit case where the standard results fail to be true. The equation is then

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial}{\partial t}u(t,x) + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\big(xu(t,x)\big) + B(x)u(t,x) = 4B(2x)u(t,2x), \qquad x > 0, \\ \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x). \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

In 1967, G. I. Bell and E. C. Anderson already noted [7]:

*"If the rate of cell growth is proportional to cell volume, then (...) a daughter cell, having just half the volume of the parent cell, will grow at just half the rate of the parent cell. It follows that if one starts with a group of cells of volume $V$, age $r$, at time 0, then any daughter cell of this group, no matter when formed, will always have a volume equal to half the volume of an undivided cell in the group. There will then be no dispersion of cell volumes with time, and the population will consist at any time of a number of cell generations differing by just a factor of 2 in volume. For more general initial conditions, the population at late times will still reflect the initial state rather than simply growing exponentially in time. "*

After [7], the reason for this specific behaviour was stated in [12, 22]: instead of a unique dominant eigenvalue, there exists a countable set of dominant eigenvalues, namely $1 + \frac{2i\pi}{\log 2}\mathbb{Z}$. O. Diekmann, H. Heijmans and H. Thieme explain in [12]:

*The total population size still behaves like $[e^t]$ but convergence in shape does not take place. Instead the initial size distribution* **turns around and around** *while numbers are multiplied. (...) The following Gedanken experiment illustrates the biological reason. Consider two cells $A$ and $B$ with equal size and assume that at some time instant $t_0$ cell $A$ splits into $a$ and $a$. During the time interval $[t_0, t_1]$, $a$, $a$ and $B$ grow and at $t_1$ cell $B$ splits into $b$ and $b$. If $g(x) = cx$, the daughter cells $a$ and $b$ will have equal sizes just as their mothers $A$ and $B$. In other words, the relation "equal size" is hereditary and extends over the generations. The growth model behaves like a multiplicating machine which copies the size distribution.*

In [18], G. Greiner and R. Nagel are the first to prove this long-time periodic behaviour. They use the theory of positive semigroups combined to spectral analysis to get the convergence to a semigroup of rotations. The method relies on some compactness arguments, which force the authors to set the equation on a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ ($x \in [\alpha, \beta]$ with $\alpha > 0$).

In the present paper, we extend the result to the equation setted on the whole $\mathbb{R}_+$. Additionally we determine explicitly towards *which* oscillatory distribution, depending *in which sense* on the initial state, a given distribution of cells should tend. Our method relies on General Relative Entropy inequalities (Section 1), which unexpectedly may be adapted to this case and is the key ingredient for an explicit convergence result (Theorem 2 in Section 2, which is the main result of our study). We illustrate our results numerically in Section 3, proposing a non-dissipative scheme able to capture the oscillations.

# 1 Eigenvalue problem and Entropy

To study the long time asymptotics of Equation (1), we elaborate on previously established results concerning the dominant positive eigenvector and general relative entropy inequalities.

## 1.1 Dominant eigenvalues and balance laws

The eigenproblem and adjoint eigenproblem related to Equation (1) are

$$\lambda \mathcal{U}(x) + \big(x\mathcal{U}(x)\big)' + B(x)\mathcal{U}(x) = 4B(2x)\mathcal{U}(2x), \tag{2}$$

$$\lambda \phi(x) - x\phi'(x) + B(x)\phi(x) = 2B(x)\phi\Big(\frac{x}{2}\Big). \tag{3}$$

Perron eigenproblem consists in finding positive solutions $\mathcal{U}$ to (2), which in general give the asymptotic behaviour of time-dependent solutions, which align along $e^{\lambda t}\mathcal{U}(x)$. Recognizing here a specific case of the eigenproblem studied in [14], we work under the following assumptions:

$$\begin{cases} B:\ (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty) \text{ is measurable,} \\ \\ B(x)/x \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+), \\ \\ \exists \gamma_0, \gamma_1, K_0, K_1 > 0,\ \exists x_0 \geqslant 0,\ \forall x \geqslant x_0, \quad K_0 x^{\gamma_0} \leqslant B(x) \leqslant K_1 x^{\gamma_1}. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

We then have the following result, which is a particular case of [14, Theorem 1].

**Theorem 1.** *Under Assumption* (4)*, there exists a unique positive eigenvector* $\mathcal{U} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ *to* (2) *normalised by* $\int_0^\infty x\mathcal{U}(x)dx = 1$*. It is related to the eigenvalue* $\lambda = 1$ *and to the adjoint eigenvector* $\phi(x) = x$ *solution to* (3)*.*

*Moreover,* $x^\alpha \mathcal{U} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ *for all* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$*, and* $\mathcal{U} \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+)$*.*

As already noticed in [12], though 1 is the unique eigenvalue related to a positive eigenvector, here it cannot be the unique dominant eigenvalue: we have a set of eigentriplets $(\lambda_k, \mathcal{U}_k, \phi_k)$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ defined by

$$\lambda_k = 1 + \frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}, \qquad \mathcal{U}_k(x) = x^{-\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}}\mathcal{U}(x), \qquad \phi_k(x) = x^{1+\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}}. \tag{5}$$

This is the first difference with the most studied case, where the Perron eigenvalue happens to be the unique dominant one: here all these eigenvalues have a real part equal to 1, so that they are all dominant. The natural questions which emerge are to know whether this set of eigenvectors is dominant and attractive, as it is the case when it is formed by a unique function; and where the usual proofs of convergence happen to differ.

First we notice an important property: the family $\big((\mathcal{U}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}, (\phi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\big)$ is biorthogonal for the bracket

$$\langle f, \varphi \rangle := \int_0^\infty f(x)\varphi(x)\,dx,$$

which means that

$$\forall (k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, \qquad \langle \mathcal{U}_k, \phi_l \rangle = \delta_{kl}. \tag{6}$$

This is a direct consequence of the normalization of the Perron eigenvectors which writes $\langle \mathcal{U}, \phi \rangle = 1$ and the fact that $\lambda_k \neq \lambda_l$ for $k \neq l$.

Eventhough we are interested in real-valued solutions to Equation (1), due to the fact that the dominant eigenelements have nonzero imaginary part, we have to work in spaces of complex-valued functions. Of course real-valued solutions are readily obtained from complex-valued solutions by taking the real or imaginary part. From now on when defining functional spaces we always consider measurable functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{C}$.

The biorthogonal property (6) can be extended into balance laws for general solutions to Equation (1). For $u_0 \in L^1(\phi(x)dx)$ and $u \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+, L^1(\phi(x)dx))$ solution to (1) we have the conservation laws

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z},\ \forall t \geqslant 0, \qquad \langle u(t,\cdot), \phi_k \rangle e^{-\lambda_k t} = \langle u_0, \phi_k \rangle. \tag{7}$$

## 1.2 General Relative Entropy inequalities

Additionally to the conservation laws above we have the following set of inequalities. In this section, we remain at a formal level, knowing the fact that all is made fully rigorous once existence and uniqueness results are stated, as for instance for the quadratic entropy in Section 2.

**Lemma 1** (General Relative Entropy Inequality)**.** *Let $B$ satisfy Assumption* (4)*, $\mathcal{U}$ the Perron eigenvector defined in Theorem 1 and $u(t,x)$ a solution of Equation* (1)*. Let $H : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ a positive, differentiable and convex function. Provided the quantities exist, we have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^\infty x\, \mathcal{U}(x) H\Big(\frac{u(t,x)}{\mathcal{U}(x)e^t}\Big) dx = -D^H[u(t)e^{-t}] \leqslant 0,$$

*with $D^H$ defined by*

$$D^H[u] := \int_0^\infty xB(x)\mathcal{U}(x)\Big[H\Big(\frac{u(\frac{x}{2})}{\mathcal{U}(\frac{x}{2})}\Big) - H\Big(\frac{u(x)}{\mathcal{U}(x)}\Big) - \nabla H\Big(\frac{u(\frac{x}{2})}{\mathcal{U}(\frac{x}{2})}\Big) \cdot \Big(\frac{u(\frac{x}{2})}{\mathcal{U}(\frac{x}{2})} - \frac{u(x)}{\mathcal{U}(x)}\Big)\Big] dx,$$

*where $\nabla H$ is the gradient of $H$ obtained by assimilating $\mathbb{C}$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover, for $H$ strictly convex, $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfies $D^H[u] = 0$* iff *it is such that*

$$\frac{u(x)}{\mathcal{U}(x)} = \frac{u(2x)}{\mathcal{U}(2x)}, \qquad a.e.\ \ x > 0.$$

*In particular, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $D^H[\mathcal{U}_k] = 0$.*

The proof is immediate and now standard, linked to a calculation term by term and the use of the equations (1), (2) and (3), see for instance [30, p.92].

In the cases where the Perron eigenvector is the unique dominant eigenvector, the entropy inequality is a key step to obtain the convergence of $u(t,x)e^{-t}$ towards $\langle u_0, \phi\rangle \mathcal{U}(x)$. The idea is to prove that $u(t,x)e^{-t}$ tends to a limit $u_\infty$ such that $D^H[u_\infty] = 0$, which in general implies that $u_\infty$ is proportional to $\mathcal{U}$; the conservation law then giving the proportionality constant.

Here however, since any function $v(x) = f(\log x)\mathcal{U}(x)$ with $f$ $\log 2$-periodic satisfies $D^H[v] = 0$, the usual convergence result does not hold. This is due to a lack of hypocoercivity in our case, since the set of functions with null entropy dissipation is stable for the dynamics of the equation, as expressed by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *Consider a strictly convex function $H$ and let $u(t,x)$ be the solution to Equation (1) with initial condition $u(0,x) = u_0(x)$. We have the invariance result*

$$D^H[u_0] = 0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad D^H[u(t,\cdot)] = 0, \quad \forall t \geqslant 0.$$

As Lemma 1, Lemma 2 has to be understood in a space where existence and uniqueness of a solution is proved, as for instance in the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, x/\mathcal{U}(x)dx)$, see Section 2.

*Proof.* We have already seen in Lemma 1 that for any $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{C}$,

$$D^H[u] = 0 \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad \frac{u(x)}{\mathcal{U}(x)} = \frac{u(2x)}{\mathcal{U}(2x)}, \quad \text{a.e.} \quad x > 0.$$

Assume that $u(t,x)$ is a solution to Equation (1) which satisfies $u(t,x)/\mathcal{U}(x) = u(t,2x)/\mathcal{U}(2x)$ for all time $t \geqslant 0$ and define $v(t,x) = u(t,x)/\mathcal{U}(x)e^{-t}$. We easily check that $v(t,x)$ is solution to the transport equation

$$\partial_t v(t,x) + x\partial_x v(t,x) = 0$$

and so $v(t,x) = v(0, xe^{-t})$. Coming back to $u(t,x)$ we get the formula

$$u(t,x) = u_0(xe^{-t})\frac{\mathcal{U}(x)\, e^t}{\mathcal{U}(xe^{-t})}. \tag{8}$$

Now consider $u_0$ such that $u_0(x)/\mathcal{U}(x) = u_0(2x)/\mathcal{U}(2x)$ for almost every $x > 0$, and define $u(t,x)$ by (8). We easily check that $u(t,x)$ is solution to Equation (1) and that it satisfies $u(t,x)/\mathcal{U}(x) = u(t,2x)/\mathcal{U}(2x)$ for all $t$ and almost all $x$, and we can conclude by uniqueness of the solution.

□

For $H(z) = |z|^p$ the entropy corresponds to the $p$-power of the norm in

$$E_p := L^p(\mathbb{R}_+, \phi(x)\mathcal{U}^{1-p}(x)\, dx).$$

Define also the space

$$E_\infty := \big\{u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{C} \text{ measurable}, \exists C > 0, |u| \leqslant C\mathcal{U} \text{ a.e.}\big\},$$

which is the analogous of $E_p$ for $p = \infty$, endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{E_\infty} := \sup_{x>0} \operatorname{ess} \frac{|u(x)|}{\mathcal{U}(x)}.$$

These spaces have the property to be stable under the dynamics of Equation (1) and to constitute a tower of continuous inclusions, as it is made more precise in the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.** *Let $p \in [1, \infty]$ and let $u(t, x)$ be the solution to Equation (1) with initial data $u_0 \in E_p$. Then $u(t, \cdot) \in E_p$ for all $t \geqslant 0$ and*

$$\|u(t, \cdot)e^{-t}\|_{E_p} \leqslant \|u_0\|_{E_p}.$$

*Proof.* For $p < \infty$, this is a direct consequence of Lemma 1 by considering the convex function $H(z) = |z|^p$. Similarly for $p = \infty$ we get the result by applying Lemma 1 with the convex function

$$H(z) = \begin{cases} |z| - C & \text{if } |z| \geqslant C \\ 0 & \text{if } |z| \leqslant C \end{cases}$$

with $C = \|u_0\|_{E_\infty}$. □

**Lemma 4.** *Let $1 \leqslant p \leqslant q \leqslant \infty$ and $u \in E_q$. Then $u \in E_p$ and*

$$\|u\|_{E_p} \leqslant \|u\|_{E_q}.$$

*Proof.* It is clear if $q = +\infty$. If $q < +\infty$ we use the Hölder inequality to write

$$\begin{aligned} \int u^p \phi \mathcal{U}^{1-p} &\leqslant \left( \int \left( u^p \phi^{\frac{p}{q}} \mathcal{U}^{\frac{p}{q}(1-q)} \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left( \int \left( \phi^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \mathcal{U}^{1-p-\frac{p}{q}(1-q)} \right)^{\frac{q}{q-p}} \right)^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \\ &\leqslant \left( \int u^q \phi \mathcal{U}^{1-q} \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left( \int \phi \mathcal{U} \right)^{1-\frac{p}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

# 2 Convergence in the quadratic norm

Equipped with the General Relative Entropy inequalities, we now combine them with Hilbert techniques to prove the convergence to periodic solutions. We first introduce the Hilbert space (Section 2.1), in which we prove the well-posedness of Equation (1) (Section 2.2). We state our main result in Theorem 2.

## 2.1 The Hilbert space

As we will see below, working in a Hilbert setting is very convenient for our study. Drawing inspiration from the General Relative Entropy with the convex quadratic function $H(z) = |z|^2$, we work in the Hilbert space

$$E_2 = L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, x/\mathcal{U}(x)\,dx)$$

endowed with the inner product

$$(f, g) := \int_0^\infty f(x)\overline{g}(x)\frac{x}{\mathcal{U}(x)}\,dx.$$

We denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the corresponding norm defined by

$$\|f\|^2 = (f, f).$$

In this space the normalization we have chosen for $\mathcal{U}$ writes

$$\|\mathcal{U}\| = \|\mathcal{U}_k\| = 1$$

and the biorthogonality property (6) writes

$$(\mathcal{U}_k, \mathcal{U}_l) = \langle \mathcal{U}_k, \phi_l \rangle = \delta_{k,l},$$

meaning that $(\mathcal{U}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is an orthonormal family in $E_2$. As a consequence the family $(\mathcal{U}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a Hilbert basis of the Hilbert space

$$X := \overline{\text{span}}(\mathcal{U}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$$

and the orthogonal projection on this closed subspace of $E_2$ is given by

$$Pu := \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} (u, \mathcal{U}_k)\mathcal{U}_k, \qquad \forall u \in E_2.$$

Additionally we have the Bessel's inequality

$$\|Pu\|^2 = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} |(u, \mathcal{U}_k)|^2 \leqslant \|u\|^2. \tag{9}$$

As it is stated in the following lemma, there is a crucial link between $X$ and the quadratic dissipation of entropy (*i.e.* $D^H[u]$ for $H(z) = |z|^2$), which can be written in a simpler way

$$D^2[u] = \int_0^\infty xB(x)\,\mathcal{U}(x)\left|\frac{u(x)}{\mathcal{U}(x)} - \frac{u(x/2)}{\mathcal{U}(x/2)}\right|^2 dx.$$

**Lemma 5.** *We have*

$$X = \{u \in E_2,\ D^2[u] = 0\}.$$

*Proof.* Since $|z|^2$ is strictly convex, we have already seen in Lemma 1 (and it is even clearer in the case of $D^2$) that

$$\{u \in E_2,\ D^2[u] = 0\} = \{u \in E_2,\ u(x)/\mathcal{U}(x) = u(2x)/\mathcal{U}(2x),\ a.e.\ x > 0\} \supset X.$$

Also we clearly have

$$\{u \in E_2,\, u(x)/\mathcal{U}(x) = u(2x)/\mathcal{U}(2x),\ a.e.\ x > 0\} = \\ \{u \in E_2,\, \exists f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}\ \log 2\text{-periodic},\, u(x) = f(\log x)\mathcal{U}(x),\ a.e.\ x > 0\}.$$

If $u \in E_2$ writes $u(x) = f(\log x)\mathcal{U}(x)$ with $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ $\log 2$-periodic then necessarily $f \in L^2([0, \log 2])$ and the Fourier theory ensures (Fourier-Riesz-Fischer theorem) that

$$f(y) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{f}(k) e^{\frac{2ik\pi y}{\log 2}},$$

where

$$\hat{f}(k) = \frac{1}{\log 2} \int_0^{\log 2} f(y) e^{-\frac{2ik\pi y}{\log 2}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}).$$

So we have in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$

$$u(x) = \mathcal{U}(x) \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{f}(k) x^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} \hat{f}(-k)\mathcal{U}_k(x) \in X.$$

We also deduce that $\hat{f}(k) = (u, \mathcal{U}_{-k})$. □

## 2.2 Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem

Since the Perron eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$ is strictly positive, it is convenient to consider a *rescaled* version of our problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial}{\partial t} v(t,x) + \dfrac{\partial}{\partial x}\big(x v(t,x)\big) + v(t,x) + B(x) v(t,x) = 4B(2x) v(t,2x), \quad x > 0, \\ \\ v(0,x) = u_0(x). \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

The solutions to Equation (1) are related to the solutions to (10) by the simple relation

$$u(t,x) = e^t v(t,x).$$

Following the lines in [17, 27, 8] we can prove that the problem (10) is well-posed in $E_1$ and admits an associated $C_0$-semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geqslant 0}$ which is positive, meaning that for any $u_0 \in E_1$ there exists a unique (mild) solution $v \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, E_1)$ to (10) which is given by $v(t) = T_t u_0$, and if $u_0 \geqslant 0$ then $v(t) \geqslant 0$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. From Lemma 3 we have that all the subspaces $E_p$ with $p \in [1, \infty]$ are stable under $(T_t)_{t \geqslant 0}$. Additionally the restriction of $T_t$ to any $E_p$ is a contraction, *i.e.*

$$\forall u \in E_p,\ \forall t \geqslant 0, \qquad \|T_t u\|_{E_p} \leqslant \|u\|_{E_p}. \tag{11}$$

To get the well-posedness of (10) in $E_2 = E_2$, it only remains to check the strong continuity of $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in $E_2$.

**Lemma 6.** *The semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ restricted to $E_2$ is strongly continuous.*

*Proof.* We use the subspace $E_\infty \subset E_2$ and the contraction property (11) to write for any $u \in E_\infty$

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_t u - u\|^2 &= \int_0^\infty (T_t u - u)^2(x) \frac{x}{\mathcal{U}(x)}\, dx \\ &\leqslant 2\|u\|_{E_\infty} \int_0^\infty |T_t u - u|(x) x\, dx = 2\|u\|_{E_\infty} \|T_t u - u\|_{E_1}.\end{aligned}$$

The strong continuity of $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in $E_1$ ensures that $\|T_t u - u\|_{E_1} \to 0$ and so $\|T_t u - u\| \to 0$ when $t \to 0$. By density of $E_\infty \subset E_2$ we get the strong continuity of $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in $E_2$.

□

We can now define the generator $\mathcal{A} : D(\mathcal{A}) \subset E_2 \to E_2$ of $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in $E_2$ by

$$\mathcal{A}u := \lim_{E_2,\, t\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t}(T_t u - u)$$

defined for every $u$ in the domain

$$D(\mathcal{A}) := \Big\{ u \in E_2 \mid \lim_{t\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t}(T_t u - u) \text{ exists in } E_2 \Big\}.$$

The domain $D(\mathcal{A})$ is a dense subspace of $E_2$ and for any $u \in D(\mathcal{A})$ we have in the distributional sense

$$\mathcal{A}u(x) = -(xu(x))' - u(x) - B(x)u(x) + 4B(2x)u(2x).$$

For every $u_0 \in E_2$, $v(t) = T_t u_0$ is the unique *mild* solution to the problem (10). In other words it is the unique continuous function $\mathbb{R}_+ \to E_2$ which satisfies $\int_0^t v(s)ds \in D(\mathcal{A})$ for all $t \geqslant 0$ and

$$v(t) = u_0 + \mathcal{A} \int_0^t v(s)\, ds.$$

If additionally $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$ then $v$ is a *classical* solution, meaning that it is continuously differentiable with respect to $E_2$, $v(t) \in D(\mathcal{A})$ for all $t \geqslant 0$ and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v}(t) = \mathcal{A}v(t), \quad \forall t > 0, \\ v(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

Notice that by definition of the eigenvectors $\mathcal{U}_k$ we have

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \qquad \mathcal{U}_k \in D(\mathcal{A}) \quad \text{and} \quad T_t\, \mathcal{U}_k = \mathcal{U}_k e^{\frac{2ik\pi t}{\log 2}} \tag{12}$$

and the conservation laws (7) also write

$$\forall u \in E_2,\ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z},\ \forall t \geqslant 0 \qquad (T_t u, \mathcal{U}_k) = (u, \mathcal{U}_k) e^{\frac{2ik\pi t}{\log 2}}. \tag{13}$$

We finish this section by giving some properties which link the semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ to the subspace $X$.

**Lemma 7.** *The semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ commutes with the projector $P$, i.e.*

$$\forall u \in E_2,\ \forall t \geqslant 0, \qquad T_t P u = P T_t u.$$

*Proof.* Let $u \in E_2$ and $t > 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the truncated projection

$$P_n u := \sum_{k=-n}^{n} (u, \mathcal{U}_k) \mathcal{U}_k.$$

Because of (12) and (13) we have

$$T_t P_n u = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} (u, \mathcal{U}_k) T_t \mathcal{U}_k = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} (u, \mathcal{U}_k) \mathcal{U}_k e^{\frac{2ik\pi t}{\log 2}} = \sum_{k=-n}^{n} (T_t u, \mathcal{U}_k) \mathcal{U}_k = P_n T_t u.$$

The fact that $T_t$ is a contraction ensures that

$$\|T_t P u - T_t P_n u\|^2 \leqslant \|P u - P_n u\|^2 = \sum_{|k|>n} |(u, \mathcal{U}_k)|^2 \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0$$

and using (13) we have

$$\|P T_t u - P_n T_t u\|^2 = \sum_{|k|>n} |(T_t u, \mathcal{U}_k)|^2 = \sum_{|k|>n} |(u, \mathcal{U}_k)|^2 \xrightarrow[n\to+\infty]{} 0.$$

□

**Corollary 1.** *The unbounded operator $(\mathcal{A}, D(\mathcal{A}))$ commutes with $P$, i.e.*

$$\forall u \in D(\mathcal{A}), \qquad P u \in D(\mathcal{A}) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathcal{A} P u = P \mathcal{A} u.$$

*Proof.* Let $u \in D(\mathcal{A})$, so that $\frac{1}{t}(T_t u - u) \xrightarrow[t\to 0]{E_2} \mathcal{A} u$. Using Lemma 7 and the Bessel's inequality (9) we deduce

$$\left\| \frac{1}{t}(T_t P u - P u) - P \mathcal{A} u \right\| \leqslant \left\| \frac{1}{t}(T_t u - u) - \mathcal{A} u \right\| \xrightarrow[t\to 0]{} 0$$

which exactly gives the result. □

The commutation of the semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ with the projector $P$ allows to recover, in a more rigorous and more precise way, the stability property in Lemma 2.

**Corollary 2.** *For $u \in X$ we have that $T_t u \in X$ for all $t \geqslant 0$, and more precisely*

$$T_t u = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} (u, \mathcal{U}_k)\, \mathcal{U}_k e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2} t}$$

*Proof.* It is a consequence of Lemma 7 and the conservation laws (13). For $u \in X$ we have

$$T_t u = T_t P u = P T_t u = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} (T_t u, \mathcal{U}_k)\, \mathcal{U}_k = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} (u, \mathcal{U}_k)\, \mathcal{U}_k e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2} t}.$$

□

## 2.3 Convergence

We are now ready to state the asymptotic behaviour of solutions to Problem 1.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume that $B$ satisfies Hypothesis (4) and define $\mathcal{U}_k$ by (5). Then for any $u_0 \in E_2$, the unique solution $u(t,x) \in C\big(\mathbb{R}_+, E_2\big)$ to Equation (1) satisfies*

$$\int_0^\infty \left| u(t,x) e^{-t} - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} (u_0, \mathcal{U}_k)\, \mathcal{U}_k(x) e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2} t} \right|^2 \frac{x\, dx}{\mathcal{U}(x)} \xrightarrow[t \to +\infty]{} 0.$$

**Remark 1.** *This convergence result can also be enunciated in terms of semigroups. Set*

$$R_t u := T_t P u = P T_t u = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (u, \mathcal{U}_k) \mathcal{U}_k e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2} t}.$$

*This defines a semigroup,*

$$R_{t+s} u = T_{t+s} P u = T_{t+s} P^2 u = T_t T_s P^2 u = T_t P T_s P u = R_t R_s u,$$

*which is* $\log 2$*-periodic. The result of Theorem 2 corresponds to the strong convergence of $(T_t)_{t \geqslant 0}$ to $(R_t)_{t \geqslant 0}$, i.e.*

$$\forall u \in E_2, \qquad \| T_t u - R_t u \| \xrightarrow[t \to +\infty]{} 0.$$

*It is also equivalent to the strong stability of $(T_t)_{t \geqslant 0}$ in $X^\perp = \operatorname{Ker} P$*

$$\forall u \in X^\perp, \qquad \| T_t u \| \xrightarrow[t \to +\infty]{} 0.$$

**Remark 2.** *We may use the Poisson summation formula to reinterpret the limit function in terms of only $u_0(x)$ : we recall that this formula states that, under proper assumptions on $f$ and its Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}f(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(y) e^{-iy\xi} dy$ we have*

$$\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} f(y + \ell a) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}f\Big(\frac{2\pi k}{a}\Big) e^{\frac{2ik\pi y}{a}}.$$

*Taking* $a = \log(2)$, $f(y) = u_0(e^{-y})e^{-2y}$, *we apply it to the limit function taken in* $y = t - \log(x)$

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (u_0, \mathcal{U}_k)\mathcal{U}_k(x)e^{\frac{2ik\pi t}{\log(2)}} = \mathcal{U}(x) \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{-2\ell}x^2e^{-2t}u_0(2^{-\ell}xe^{-t}).$$

*This formula is reminiscent of a similar one found in [13], Theorem 1.3. (b), for the limit case* $B$ *constant.*

*Proof of Theorem 2.* We follow here the classical proof of convergence, pioneered in [25, 26]. Though the limit is now an oscillating function, this strategy may be adapted here, as shown below.

Define

$$h(t,x) := u(t,x)e^{-t} - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} (u_0, \mathcal{U}_k)\,\mathcal{U}_k(x)e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}t} = (I-P)T_t u_0$$

which is solution to Equation (1). Lemma 3 with $p = 2$ ensures that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|h(t,\cdot)\| \leqslant 0,$$

so that it decreases through time. Since it is a nonnegative quantity, it means that it tends toward a limit $L \geqslant 0$ and it remains to show that $L = 0$. Let us adapt to our case the proof in B. Perthame's book, p.98 sq [30]. Because of the contraction property, it is sufficient to do so for $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$ which is a dense subspace of $E_2$. Recall that for $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$ the solution to Equation (1) can be understood as a classical solution, $u(t,\cdot)$ belonging to $D(\mathcal{A})$ for all time. Since Corollary 1 ensures that $P(D(\mathcal{A})) \subset D(\mathcal{A})$, we have $h(0,\cdot) \in D(\mathcal{A})$. Define $q(t,x) = \partial_t h(t,x)$ which is clearly solution to Equation (1) with initial data

$$q(t=0,x) = \mathcal{A}h(t=0,x).$$

By contraction we get

$$\|q(t,\cdot)\| \leqslant \|\mathcal{A}h(0,\cdot)\|.$$

Introduce the sequence of functions $h_n(t,\cdot) = h(t+n,\cdot)$. Since $h$ and $\partial_t h$ are uniformly bounded in the Hilbert space $E_2$, the Ascoli and Banach-Alaoglu theorems ensure that $(h_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is compact in $C([0,T], E_2^{\mathrm{w}})$ where $E_2^{\mathrm{w}}$ is $E_2$ endowed with the weak topology. After extracting a subsequence, still denoted $h_n$, we have $h_n \to g$ in $C([0,T], E_2^{\mathrm{w}})$. Additionally we have

$$\int_0^T D^2[h_n(t,\cdot)]\,dt = \int_n^{T+n} D^2[h(t,\cdot)]\,dt \to 0$$

since

$$\int_0^{\infty} D^2[h(t,\cdot)]\,dt < +\infty.$$

We deduce that $h_n(t,x)/\mathcal{U}(x) - h_n(t,2x)/\mathcal{U}(2x) \rightharpoonup 0$ in the distributional sense, and it ensures that $D^2[g(t,\cdot)] = 0$ for all $t \geqslant 0$ since $h_n \rightharpoonup g$. By Lemma 5 this means that $g(t,\cdot) \in X$ for all time $t \geqslant 0$. But for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t \geqslant 0$ we have $h_n(t,\cdot) \in X^\perp = \mathrm{Ker}P$ by construction of $h$, and since $X^\perp$ is a linear subspace, the weak limit $g$ of $h_n$ also satisfies $g(t,\cdot) \in X^\perp$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. Finally $g(t,\cdot) \in X \cap X^\perp = \{0\}$ for all $t \geqslant 0$, so $g \equiv 0$ and the proof is complete.

□

The result in Theorem 2 contradicts the property of asynchronous exponential growth which states that the solutions behave like $u(t,x) \sim \langle u_0, \phi\rangle \mathcal{U}(x) e^t$ when $t \to +\infty$. This property is satisfied for a large class of growth-fragmentation equations [26], but the lack of hypocoercivity in our case prevents it from such a behaviour. However we can deduce from Theorem 2 a "mean asynchronous exponential growth" property, in line with probabilistic results, e.g. [15].

**Corollary 3.** *Under Assumption* (4)*, the semigroup* $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ *generated by* $(\mathcal{A}, D(\mathcal{A}))$ *is* mean ergodic*, i.e.*

$$\forall u \in E_2, \qquad \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t T_s u \, ds \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{} P_0 u = (u,\mathcal{U})\,\mathcal{U} = \langle u, \phi\rangle \mathcal{U}.$$

*Proof.* Because of Theorem 2, it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t R_s u \, ds = P\left(\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t T_s u \, ds\right) \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{} P_0 u.$$

Denoting $m_t = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t T_s u \, ds$ we have

$$Pm_t = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} (m_t, \mathcal{U}_k)\mathcal{U}_k.$$

By the conservation laws (7) we have for $k \neq 0$

$$(m_t,\mathcal{U}_k) = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t (T_s u, \mathcal{U}_k)\, ds = (u,\mathcal{U}_k)\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}s} ds = (u,\mathcal{U}_k)\frac{\log 2}{2ik\pi}\frac{e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}t} - 1}{t}$$

and $(m_t,\mathcal{U}_0) = (u,\mathcal{U}_0)$. This gives

$$Pm_t = P_0 u + \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k\neq 0} (u,\mathcal{U}_k)\frac{\log 2}{2ik\pi}\,\mathcal{U}_k\big(e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}t} - 1\big).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \sum_{k\neq 0} (u,\mathcal{U}_k)\frac{\log 2}{2ik\pi}\,\mathcal{U}_k\big(e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}t} - 1\big)\right\|^2 &= \sum_{k\neq 0}\left|(u,\mathcal{U}_k)\frac{\log 2}{2ik\pi}\big(e^{\frac{2ik\pi}{\log 2}t} - 1\big)\right|^2 \\ &\leqslant \Big(\frac{\log 2}{\pi}\Big)^2 \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |(u,\mathcal{U}_k)|^2 = \Big(\frac{\log 2}{\pi}\Big)^2 \|Pu\|^2\end{aligned}$$

we conclude that

$$\|Pm_t - P_0 u\| \leqslant \frac{1}{t}\frac{\log 2}{\pi}\|Pu\| \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{} 0.$$

□

# 3 Numerical solution

## 3.1 A first-order non dissipative numerical scheme

In order to capture the oscillatory behaviour, the numerical scheme must avoid as much as possible to be dissipative. Indeed, we can consider the specific case we are looking at as a "lack of dissipativity", any descendant of a cell of size $x$ at time 0 remaining in the countable set $2^{-n}xe^t$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Any discrepancy between the exact equation and the numerical scheme will lead to an equation with variability, which will converge towards a unique steady profile. When discretising the equation, there are two possible sources of dissipation:

- the transport equation $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(xu)$ : to avoid any dissipation, we would like a Courant-Friedrichs-Lévy (CFL) condition equal to 1.
- the fragmentation term $4B(2x)u(t,2x) - B(x)u(t,x)$ : to avoid any dissipation, we would like to have a point of the grid for both $x$ and $2x$.

The second condition leads us to choose a grid $x_k = (1+\delta x)^{k-N}$ with $1+\delta x = 2^{\frac{1}{n}}$ for $k_0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $0 \leqslant k \leqslant 2N$. Then for any $k \in [\![0, 2N]\!]$, $2x_k = x_{k+n}$ is in the grid. On this grid, the transport part of the equation gives

$$\frac{u_k^{l+1} - u_k^l}{\delta t} + \frac{x_k u_k^l - x_{k-1}u_{k-1}^l}{x_k - x_{k-1}} = 0.$$

The CFL condition is then $1 - \frac{\delta t . x_k}{x_k - x_{k-1}} \geqslant 0$. Since $x_k - x_{k-1} = x_{k-1}\delta x$, the CFL condition then gives

$$\delta t \leqslant \frac{\delta x}{1+\delta x}.$$

In order to be allowed to use the optimal non dissipative CFL condition $\delta t = \frac{\delta x}{1+\delta x}$, we use a splitting between the transport and the fragmentation: we solve successively

1. First step: intermediate value $u_k^{l+\frac{1}{2}}$ given by

$$\frac{u_k^{l+\frac{1}{2}} - u_k^l}{\delta t} + \frac{x_k u_k^l - x_{k-1}u_{k-1}^l}{x_k - x_{k-1}} = 0, \qquad \delta t = \frac{\delta x}{1+\delta x}, \qquad u_0^{l+\frac{1}{2}} = 0.$$

2. Second step: fragmentation operator:

$$\frac{u_k^{l+1} - u_k^{l+\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta t} + B(x_k) u_k^{l+\frac{1}{2}} = 4B(x_{k+n}) u_{k+n}^{l+\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad u_{N+i}^{l+\frac{1}{2}} = 0.$$

In order to have stability for the second part of the scheme, we impose

$$\delta t = \frac{\delta x}{1 + \delta x} \leqslant \frac{1}{\max\limits_{0 \leqslant k \leqslant 2N} (B(x_k))}.$$

## 3.2 Illustration

We illustrate here the case $B(x) = x^2$: in Figure 1, we draw the real part of the first eigenvectors, taken for $k = 0, 1, 2$. The oscillatory behaviour will depend on the projection of the initial condition on the space generated by $(\mathcal{U}_k)$: it will be stronger if the coefficients for $k \neq 0$ are large compared to the projection on $\mathcal{U}_0$. We show two results for two different initial condition (Figure 2, Left and Right respectively), one a peak very close to a Dirac and the other very smooth. In both cases, the solution oscillates, as showed in Figures 3 and 4, though since the projections on $X$ are very different (with a much higher projection coefficient on the positive eigenvector for the smooth case than for the sharp case) these oscillations take very different forms. In the second case, they are so small that for any even slightly dissipative numerical scheme they are absorbed by the dissipativity, leading to a seemingly convergence towards the dominant positive eigenvector. We also see that the equation is no more regularizing: discontinuities remain asymptotically for the Heaviside case.




Figure 1: The real part for the three first eigenvectors $\mathcal{U}_0$, $\mathcal{U}_1$ $\mathcal{U}_2$ for $B(x) = x^2$. We see the oscillatory behaviour for $\mathcal{U}_1$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$.




Figure 2: Two different initial conditions. Left: peak in $x = 2$. Right: $u_0(x) = x^2 \exp(-x^2/2)$.




Figure 3: Time evolution of $\max_{x>0} u(t,x)e^{-t}$. Left: for the peak as initial condition. Right: for the smooth initial condition.

# Discussion

We studied here the asymptotic behaviour of a non-hypocoercive case of the growth-fragmentation equation. In this case, the growth being exponential and the division giving rise to two perfectly equal-sized offspring, the descendants of a given cell all remain in a countable set of characteristics. This weak dissipativity results in a periodic behaviour, the solution tending to its projection on the span of the dominant eigenvectors. Despite this, we were able to adapt the proofs based on general relative entropy inequalities, which provide an explicit expression for the limit.

Our result could without effort be generalised to the conservative case, where only one of the offspring is kept at each division: in Equation (1), the term $4B(2x)u(2x)$ is then replaced by $2B(2x)u(2x)$. The consequence is then simply that the dominant eigenvalue is zero, a simple calculation shows that the dominant positive eigenvector is $x\mathcal{U}(x)$, and all the study is unchanged.

Equation (1) may also be viewed as a Kolmogorov equation of a piecewise




Figure 4: Size distribution $u(t,x)e^{-t}$ at five different times (each time is in a different grey). Left: for the peak as initial condition. Right: for the smooth initial condition.

deterministic Markov process, *i.e.* as the equation satisfied by the expectation of the empirical measure of this process, see [11, 20]. Our study corresponds exactly to the case without variability in the growth rate studied in [15]. In [15], a convergence result towards an invariant measure for the distribution of new-born cells is proved (this measure being $xB(x)\mathcal{U}(x)$ up to a multiplicative constant). However, this does not contradict the above study, because the convergence result concerns successive generations and not a time-asymptotics. A deterministic equivalent corresponds to studying the behaviour of a time-average of the equation. Corollary 3 confirms that if we rescale the solution by $e^{-t}$ and average it over a time-period, it does converge towards $\mathcal{U}$.

Our result could also easily be extended to the case where the division kernel is self similar, *i.e.* $k(y,dx) = \frac{1}{y}k_0(\frac{dx}{y})$, and is a sum of Dirac masses specifically linked by the following relation (see Condition H in [13]): $Supp(k_0) = \Sigma$ where $\Sigma$ is such that

$$\exists L \in \mathbb{N}^* \cup \{+\infty\},\ \exists \theta \in (0,1),\ \exists (p_\ell)_{\ell\in\mathbb{N},\ \ell\leqslant L} \subset \mathbb{N},\ 0 < p_\ell < p_{\ell+1}\ \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N},\ \ell \leqslant L-1,$$
$$\Sigma = \{\sigma_\ell \in (0,1); \sigma_\ell = \theta^{p_\ell}\}, \qquad (p_\ell)_{0\leqslant\ell\leqslant L} \text{ are setwise coprime.}$$

This condition expresses the fact that all the descendants of a given individual evolve permanently on the same countable set of characteristic curves. The case of binary fission into two equal parts corresponds to $L = 1$ and $p_L = \frac{1}{2}$. Note also that for the same reason, an oscillatory behaviour also happens for the coagulation equation in the case of the so-called *diagonal kernel* [23].

Other generalisations may also be envisaged, for instance to enriched equations, or to other growth rate functions satisfying $g(2x) = 2g(x)$, see [12], that is, functions of the form $g(x) = x\Phi(\log(x))$ where $\Phi$ a $\log(2)$ periodic function.

An interesting future work could consist in strengthening the convergence result in Theorem 2. Indeed this result does not provide any rate of decay and the speed of convergence may depend on the initial data $u_0$. A uniform

exponential convergence would be ensured for instance by [28, Proposition C-IV.2.13], provided that one can prove that 0 is pole of $\mathcal{A}$. This appears to be a difficult question, which is equivalent to the uniform stability of $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in $X^\perp$ or to the uniform mean ergodicity of $(T_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in $E_2$.

We chose to work in weighted $L^2$ spaces because the theory may be developed both very simply and elegantly in this framework, where the terms are interpreted in terms of scalar product and Fourier decomposition. The asymptotic result of Theorem 2 should be generalised easily to weighted $L^1$ spaces, by considering the entropy inequality with an adequate convex functional. Developing a theory in terms of measure-valued solutions, in the same spirit as in [19], would also be of interest, since the equation has no regularising effect: an initial Dirac mass leads to a countable set of Dirac masses at any time.

**Acknowledgments**

P.G. has been supported by the ANR project KIBORD, ANR-13-BS01-0004, funded by the French Ministry of Research. M.D. has been supported by the ERC Starting Grant SKIPPER$^{AD}$ (number 306321).

# References

[1] J. Arlotti, L.; Banasiak. *Perturbations of Positive Semigroups with Applications*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, London, 2006.

[2] D. Balagué, J. Cañizo, and P. Gabriel. Fine asymptotics of profiles and relaxation to equilibrium for growth-fragmentation equations with variable drift rates. *Kinetic Related Models*, 2013. in press.

[3] J. Banasiak. On a non-uniqueness in fragmentation models. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 25(7):541–556, 2002.

[4] J. Banasiak and W. Lamb. The discrete fragmentation equation: Semigroups, compactness and asynchronous exponential growth. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 5(2):223–236, 2012.

[5] J. Banasiak, K. Pichór, and R. Rudnicki. Asynchronous exponential growth of a general structured population model. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 119(1):149–166, 2012.

[6] G. I. Bell. Cell growth and division: III. Conditions for Balanced Exponential Growth in a Mathematical Model. *Biophysical Journal*, 8(4):431 – 444, 1968.

[7] G. I. Bell and E. C. Anderson. Cell growth and division: I. a mathematical model with applications to cell volume distributions in mammalian suspension cultures. *Biophysical Journal*, 7(4):329 – 351, 1967.

[8] E. Bernard and P. Gabriel. Exponential convergence to the steady size distribution in the growth-fragmentation equation with unbounded fragmentation rate. In preparation.

[9] J. Bertoin and A. Watson. Probabilistic aspects of critical growth-fragmentation equations. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 9 2015.

[10] M. J. Cáceres, J. A. Cañizo, and S. Mischler. Rate of convergence to the remarkable state for fragmentation and growth-fragmentation equations. *Journal de Mathematiques Pures et Appliquees*, 96(4):334–362, 2011.

[11] B. Cloez. Limit theorems for some branching measure-valued processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 2016.

[12] O. Diekmann, H. Heijmans, and H. Thieme. On the stability of the cell size distribution. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 19:227–248, 1984.

[13] M. Doumic and M. Escobedo. Time asymptotics for a critical case in fragmentation and growth-fragmentation equations. *Kinetic and Related Models*, 9(2):251–297, june 2016.

[14] M. Doumic and P. Gabriel. Eigenelements of a general aggregation-fragmentation model. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 20(05):757, 2009.

[15] M. Doumic, M. Hoffmann, N. Krell, and L. Robert. Statistical estimation of a growth-fragmentation model observed on a genealogical tree. *Bernoulli*, 21(3):1760–1799, 2015.

[16] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel. *One-parameter Semigroups for Linear Evolution Equations*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.

[17] M. Escobedo, S. Mischler, and M. Rodriguez Ricard. On self-similarity and stationary problem for fragmentation and coagulation models. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 22(1):99–125, 2005.

[18] G. Greiner and R. Nagel. Growth of cell populations via one-parameter semigroups of positive operators. In J. Goldstein, , S. Rosencrans, , and G. Sod, editors, *Mathematics Applied to Science*, pages 79 – 105. Academic Press, 1988.

[19] P. Gwiazda and E. Wiedemann. Generalized entropy method for the renewal equation with measure data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.07657*, 2016.

[20] B. Haas. Asymptotic behavior of solutions of the fragmentation equation with shattering: an approach via self-similar Markov processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 20(2):382–429, 2010.

[21] A. J. Hall and G. C. Wake. Functional-differential equations determining steady size distributions for populations of cells growing exponentially. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. B*, 31(4):434–453, 1990.

[22] H. Heijmans. An eigenvalue problem related to cell growth. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 111:253–280, 1985.

[23] P. Laurençot, B. Niethammer, and J. J. L. Velázquez. Oscillatory dynamics in Smoluchowski's coagulation equation with diagonal kernel. *ArXiv e-prints*, Mar. 2016.

[24] P. Laurençot and B. Perthame. Exponential decay for the growth-fragmentation/cell-division equation. *Comm. Math. Sc.*, 7(2):503–510, 2009.

[25] P. Michel, S. Mischler, and B. Perthame. General entropy equations for structured population models and scattering. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 338(9):697–702, 2004.

[26] P. Michel, S. Mischler, and B. Perthame. General relative entropy inequality: an illustration on growth models. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 84(9):1235–1260, 2005.

[27] S. Mischler and J. Scher. Spectral analysis of semigroups and growth-fragmentation equations. *Annales de l'IHP, Série C*, 2015.

[28] R. Nagel. *One-parameter Semigroups of Positive Operators*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1986.

[29] K. Pakdaman, B. Perthame, and D. Salort. Adaptation and fatigue model for neuron networks and large time asymptotics in a nonlinear fragmentation equation. *The Journal of Mathematical Neuroscience*, 4(14):1–26, 2014.

[30] B. Perthame. *Transport equations in biology*. Frontiers in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.

[31] B. Perthame and L. Ryzhik. Exponential decay for the fragmentation or cell-division equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 210(1):155–177, 2005.

[32] J. Sinko and W. Streifer. A model for populations reproducing by fission. *Ecology*, 52(2):330–335, 1971.

[33] A. A. Zaidi, B. van Brunt, and G. C. Wake. A model for asymmetrical cell division. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 12(3):491–501, 2015.

[34] A. A. Zaidi, B. Van Brunt, and G. C. Wake. Solutions to an advanced functional partial differential equation of the pantograph type. *Proc. A.*, 471(2179):20140947, 15, 2015.